

***Request For Examiner Interview***

In the event the Examiner is inclined to issue another rejection in this case, the undersigned respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the case before doing so.

**Remarks**

In the action, 1-3, 5 and 7-14 were rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,498,695 to Pardo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,244,457 to Piotrowski et al. Claims 4 and 6 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of prior claim 4 and should therefore be allowable. Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 and should therefore also be allowable.

Claims 7-10 have been canceled.

Each of claims 11, 13 and 14 have been amended to further define that the condensate rim of the steam kettle lid does not extend completely around the lid. The claims also require that the condensate rim be positioned to cause condensate to run back into the kettle when the arm is in the up position. Claims 11, 13 and 14 likewise require that significant rotation of the lid is limited in order to prevent the condensate rim from moving to an incorrect position where it cannot serve its intended function.

In contrast, Pardo teaches a rim that drains moisture away from the cooker (see col. 7, lines 36-41). Pardo teaches this because the Pardo device is a pressurized fryer and its cabinet 12 is intended to hold hot oil. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Pardo to solve a problem associated with a condensate rim that is designed to direct condensate back into the


Piotrowski et al. teaches a gauge hatch (primarily for reactors, processing devices, storage tanks etc.) in which the bottom of the lid includes an apron 34 that is used for a sealing purpose. In particular, the lower edge 51 of the apron 34 is positioned below the sealing fluid 52 when the lid is in the closed position (see Fig. 1). While it appears that Piotrowski et al. teaches a lid that floats for advantageous seating purposes, it is unclear why rotation of the lid is prevented. Rotation of the gauge hatch lid is certainly not prevented for any reason related to the apron 34, as **the apron 34 circumscribes the entirety of the lid** and therefore its effectiveness is not effected by the rotational position of the lid. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would

not look to Piotrowski et al. to solve a problem associated with a condensate rim that extends only partly about the lid.

Accordingly, Pardo and Piotrowski et al. teach lid structures for unrelated devices. Applicants contend that one of ordinary skill in the art of pressurized fryers would not look to the gauge hatch teachings of Piotrowski et al. in order to modify the lid of Pardo. Moreover, even if Pardo and Piotrowski et al. are combined, the combination does not result in the claimed invention. In particular, the combination does not result in a steam kettle with a lid having a condensate rim that does not extend completely around the lid and that is positioned so as to cause condensate to run back into the kettle when the arm is in the up position. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Nieberding', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Nieberding  
Reg. No. 39,316

THOMPSON HINE LLP  
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE  
10 West Second Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758  
Telephone (937) 443-6892  
Facsimile: (937) 443-6635